

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to the rejection raised by the Office Action and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Further, the Applicants do not acquiesce to any of the Office Action rejections not particularly addressed. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

1. Applicant-Initiated Interview

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his time on Friday, October 22, 2004 to discuss the outstanding Office Action. As discussed during the interview and noted below, the Applicants submit that terminal proxy of US Patent 6,445,695 (fig. 1 box 150) is not, as asserted by the Office Action, an edge device as claimed. To this end, the Applicants pointed to several areas in the specification that show that the terminal proxy is not in the call path. See, e.g., col. 5, lines 50-64 and col. 3 lines 15-30. See also Fig. 1, which clearly shows (dashed versus dotted lines) that the terminal proxy is only connected directly with the network interface (box 110) and network server (box 170) via the signaling path. In light of the foregoing and as noted below, the Applicants submit that the Office Action has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and therefore, submit that the claims are allowable.

2. Allowed and Allowable Claims

The Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 12-15, and 36-43, and noting that claims 2-8, 10, 17-19, 22-24, 26-32, and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

3. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Applicants note that the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, 11, 16, 20, 25, 33, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(e) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,279, granted to Kalmanek et al. ("*Kalmanek*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,445,695, granted to Christie et al. ("*Christie*"). The Applicants submit that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness because in order to establish the required *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention by applying a combination of references, (1) the proposed combination must teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention, (2) the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention, and (3) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings.

To this end, the Applicants submit that *Christie* does not support the proposition that the Examiner proposes, because the "terminal proxy" of *Christie* is not an edge device and unlike the presently claimed invention. In the presently claimed invention, the edge device is in the pathway of the call. As can be readily discerned by a fair reading of *Christie*, the terminal proxy of *Christie* is not in the pathway of the call. Nevertheless, the Applicants desire to pass this application to issue as soon as possible, and thus, have amended the claims to place the application in condition for allowance.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Applicants have amended it to include the elements of claim 2, which as noted, would be allowable if so rewritten. Claim 2 has been cancelled because its elements are now included in claim 1. Claims 3-11 now ultimately depend from amended independent claim 1. As such, the Applicants submit that dependent claims 3-11 are allowable for the same reasons as amended independent claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 16, the Applicants have amended it to include the elements of claim 17, which as noted, would be allowable if so rewritten. Claim 17 has been cancelled because its elements are now included in claim 1. Claims 18-19 now ultimately depend from amended independent claim 16. As such, the Applicants submit that dependent claims 18-19 are allowable for the same reasons as amended independent claim 16.

With respect to independent claim 20, the Applicants have amended it to include elements similar to the elements added to amended independent claim 1 in the present amendment. The Applicants submit that, as amended, the independent claim 20 is allowable for the same reasons as the amended independent claim 1 is now allowable. Claims 21 and 22 now ultimately depend from amended independent claim 1. As such, the Applicants submit that dependent claims 21 and 22 are allowable for the same reasons as amended independent claim 20.

With respect to independent claim 25, the Applicants have amended it to include elements similar to the elements added to amended independent claim 1 in the present amendment. The Applicants submit that, as amended, the independent claim 25 is allowable for the same reasons as the amended independent claim 1 is now allowable. Claims 26-35 now ultimately depend from amended independent claim 25. As such, the Applicants submit that dependent claims 26-35 are allowable for the same reasons as amended independent claim 25.

4. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-16, 18-43 are in good and proper form for allowance, and the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would otherwise expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at 312-913-3304.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 27, 2004

By: 

Julian F. Santos
Reg. No. 47,917
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6709
312-913-0001
santos@mbhb.com